



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,556	09/05/2006	Thomas Zeng	134188WOUS (WJT002-0107)	7224
72824	7590	08/17/2009	EXAMINER	
Law Office of WILLIAM J. TUCKER 2631 Lakeforest Ct. Dallas, TX 75214			DUBASKY, GIGI L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2421		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/17/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/598,556	ZENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GIGI L. DUBASKY	2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4-9,12-17 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-9,12-17 and 20-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/15/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Claims 2-3, 10-11 and 18-19 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-17 and 20-24 are pending.

2. Applicants' arguments of the Remarks filled on 07/15/2009 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Although a new ground of rejection has been used to address the amended claims, a response is considered necessary for applicant's arguments since the references Deshpande and Tao will continue to be used to meet several claimed limitations.

In response to Applicants' argument with respect to the Tao reference that Tao appears to disclose known playlist hierarchies that are unrelated to media identifier dimensions of a RTSP multidimensional pointer, examiner respectfully disagrees. Deshpande disclose a RTSP playlist, as a RTSP multidimensional pointer, includes information about a number of individual media files (¶ [0004] lines 1-5) and has segments from different videos stored on different servers (¶ [0049] lines 1-9). And it is only relied on Tao reference to teach the depository of digital multimedia content is organized into a nested hierarchical arrangement having a plurality of levels.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-9, 12-17 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deshpande (US 2005/0071881) in view of Schulzrinne (RFC 2326 – Real Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP), April 1998) and further in view of Tao et al (US 6441832).

Regarding claim 1, Deshpande discloses a method for retrieving digital multimedia content from a network node, comprising:
receiving a Real-Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP)-compliant PLAYLIST PLAY

message, that includes at least one multidimensional pointer at said network node, said multidimensional pointer associated with a media clip in a depository of digital multimedia content (¶ [0105]-[0108] for sending a RTSP PLAY request (message) to the RTSP server from the client for playing each video segment in the requested playlist with the corresponding npt time value to indicate when to playback each video segment or when to switch to the next video segment; ¶ [0046] lines 1-4 for transmitting data from client to server and vice versa through one or more intermediate nodes on the network; ¶ [0004] lines 1-5 for a “playlist” including information about a number of individual media files; and ¶ [0049] lines 1-9 for each playlist has segments from different videos stored on different servers. In other words, the RTSP PLAY request sent from the client to server through the network nodes includes indication of the requested playlist which has equal functional manner as a multidimensional pointer to a media clip in a depository of digital multimedia content), said message further including a relative time offset within said media clip (¶ [0075] lines 8-10); and transferring digital multimedia content to a digital multimedia device by said network node from a particular content source identified by said multidimensional pointer (see Figure 1; ¶ [0046] lines 1-4 and step 1310 in Figure 13), said transferring commencing at a time indicated (¶ [0102], ¶ [0104] lines 4-8 and ¶ [0105]-[0108]).

Deshpande discloses the received Normal Play Time (npt) value indicating when to playback each video segment or when to switch to the next video segment (¶ [0105]-[0108]). However, Deshpande does not explicitly disclose the message including a

timing parameter operable to indicate when said message is to be activated by said network node.

Schulzrinne (in the memo of RFC2326 - Real Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP)) discloses the RTSP PLAY message from client to server includes fields such as playlist identifier (URL), Cseq, Section and Range; Range header defines npt, smpte or clock values and also includes a time parameter specifying a time in UTC at which the playback should start (section 10.5) or at which the operation is to be made effective (section 12.29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Deshpande's RTSP message to include a time parameter as taught by Schulzrinne, so to help the system in synchronization of streams obtained from different sources.

The combined system of Deshpande and Schulzrinne fails to disclose depository of digital multimedia content is organized into a nested hierarchical arrangement having a plurality of levels.

Tao discloses the depository of digital multimedia content is organized into a nested hierarchical arrangement having a plurality of levels (abstract, Figure 10-16 and Col 1 lines 44-58).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combined system of Deshpande and Schulzrinne with the teaching of Tao, so to provide readily and organized performance of editing and displaying playlists.

Regarding claim 4, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The combined system further discloses a first level of said depository of digital multimedia content comprises at least one server-side playlist identified by a uniform resource locator (taught by Deshpande; ¶ [0003] lines 4-8, ¶ [0027] lines 5-6 and ¶ [0049] lines 10-16; and also taught by Schulzrinne; see URLs defined in section 10.5).

Regarding claim 5, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 4. The combined system further discloses at least one server-side playlist includes one or more media clips (taught by Deshpande; ¶ [0049] and ¶ [0112]), each being identified by a corresponding media source identifier and a relative time offset within said media clip (taught by Tao; Figure 12-15; Col 10, lines 54-67 and Col 15, lines 52-56).

Regarding claim 6, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The combined system further discloses the digital multimedia device accesses said network node over at least one of a wire line network, a wireless network, or a cable network (taught by Deshpande; ¶ [0046] lines 4-16 and ¶ [0116]).

Regarding claim 7, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The combined system further discloses digital multimedia device comprises at least one of: digital music players, digital video players, computers or handheld communication devices enabled to accept streaming media (taught by Deshpande; see Figure 14; ¶ [0005] lines 4-9 and ¶ [0114]-[0117]).

Regarding claim 8, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The combined system further discloses the timing parameter (taught by Schulzrinne; section 10.5 and 12.9) is operable to assume a value selected from the group consisting of: NOW, END OF CLIP, END OF PLAYLIST (The claim language “group consisting of” does not require all limitations are met. It is taught by Deshpande; ¶ [0106]-[0108] for playing back to back video segments in the playlist with the npt value indicated when the next segment is played which means that the next segment is played right at the end frame/clip of the previous segment. This meets the limitation of “END OF CLIP”. Moreover, Schulzrinne also discloses the normal play time can be set to NOW value for live feed request (section 3.6). Therefore, the request to play in real-time from the clients with the npt set to NOW is interpreted as when the request is satisfied corresponding to the NOW value of the npt time).

Regarding claim 9, all limitations of claimed system in claim 9 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 1. So claim 9 is rejected on the same ground as claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, all limitations of claimed system in claim 12 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 4. So claim 12 is rejected on the same ground as claim 4.

Regarding claim 13, all limitations of claimed system in claim 13 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 5. So claim 13 is rejected on the same ground as claim 5.

Regarding claim 14, all limitations of claimed system in claim 14 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 6. So claim 14 is rejected on the same ground as claim 6.

Regarding claim 15, all limitations of claimed system in claim 15 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 7. So claim 15 is rejected on the same ground as claim 7.

Regarding claim 16, all limitations of claimed system in claim 16 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 8. So claim 16 is rejected on the same ground as claim 8.

Regarding claim 17, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses a digital multimedia device which all functionalities are analyzed and rejected corresponding to the discussion in the rejection of claim 1. The combined system further discloses a logic for receiving a Real-Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP)-compliant PLAYLIST PLAY message (¶ [0105]-[0108] and ¶ [0113]-[0114]) and a player engine (element 106 in Figure 1 or element 220 in Figure 2 or elements 1414 and 1416 in Figure 14).

Regarding claim 20, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. The combined system further discloses a first level of said plurality of media identifier dimensions comprises a uniform resource locator identifying a server-side playlist (taught by Deshpande; ¶ [0003] lines 4-8, ¶ [0027] lines 5-6 and ¶ [0049] lines 10-16; also taught by Schulzrinne in the section 10.5).

Regarding claim 21, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 20. The combined system further discloses a second level of said plurality of media identifier dimensions

comprises at least one of a media source identifier for identifying a particular media clip (taught by Tao; see Figure 11-12. Examiner interpreted Figure 11 as the first level of the plurality of media identifier dimensions because it includes all the playlist identifiers and Figure 12 as the second level which includes plurality of clip identifiers) within said server-side playlist (taught by Deshpande; ¶ [0049] for playlist is stored at the server).

Regarding claim 22, Deshpande in view of Schulzrinne and further in view of Tao discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 21. The combined system further discloses the multidimensional pointer includes a relative time offset within said particular media clip (taught by Tao; see Figure 12-15; Col 10 lines 54-67 and Col 15 lines 52-56).

Regarding claim 23, Deshpande discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. The limitations of claim 23 are analyzed and rejected corresponding to the discussion in the rejection of claim 6.

Regarding claim 24, Deshpande discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. The limitations of claim 24 are analyzed and rejected corresponding to the discussion in the rejection of claim 8.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GIGI L. DUBASKY whose telephone number is (571)270-5686. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

GD